REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated June 22, 2007. Claims 1, 2, 19, 21, 23 and 51-54 are presented for examination and have been amended to define still more clear what Applicant regards as his invention, of which Claims 1, 2, 19, 21 and 23 are in independent form. Claims 1, 2, 19, 21 and 23 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 19, 21 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,973,685 (*Schaffa*) in view of U.S. Patent 5,978,013 (*Jones*), and Claims 51-54, as being unpatentable over *Schaffa* in view of *Jones* and U.S. Patent 6,507,362 (*Akerib*).

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a digital broadcast receiving apparatus that comprises means for setting a digital broadcast program and a print reservation of partial content which is provided in the program and can be displayed on a display when the program plays, in advance, based on a table of programs received from a digital broadcast station. There are also provided means for receiving a digital broadcast of the program set by the setting means, and means for extracting the partial content set by the setting means. Judging means judge whether or not extracted partial content includes an information part print-output of which is not permitted, based on print information in a header of the partial content, the print information indicating whether printing of the information part is permitted or not permitted, and printing means print-output the extracted partial content. More specifically, the printing means print-output only that

portion of the extracted partial content other than the information part when the judging means judge that the extracted partial content includes the information part.

One notable feature of the apparatus of Claim 1 is, that when content permitted to be displayed includes a print-prohibition part (i.e., a part that is not to be permitted to be printed), a user who has reserved (i.e., pre-ordered) printing of the content, is prohibited from printing the print-prohibition part. The apparatus of Claim 1, it should be noted, only prohibits printing of the print-prohibition part. The user can still obtain a print-out of the desired content, except for the print-prohibition part.

The *Jones* system, as understood by Applicant, is for printing coupons from a broadcaster, and permits a user to print a coupon when a broadcaster gives permission, and only during the broadcast, not in advance. Thus, printing the entire coupon is either permitted or prohibited, and if permitted, is only possible while the broadcast is actually being aired.

Applicant understands that in the Examiner's view, *Jones* discloses the means for extracting partial content and the judging means of Claim 1. The Examiner's position is understood to be that selecting an individual coupon out of a plurality of stored coupons is equivalent to "extracting the partial content," as recited in Claim 1. Applicant notes, however, that in *Jones*, the selection of an item is among items of the same type, and is not a portion (partial content) of a larger digital broadcast program that can be displayed together on a display. For this reason, Applicant does not agree with the Examiner's analysis.

Nonetheless, in an effort to eliminate this as an issue, Applicant also notes that Claim 1 recites that whether or not a content includes a print-prohibition part is based

on print information in a header of the content (see FIGS. 8 and 14).[1/] This feature makes it possible to control the print prohibition from the broadcast station.

Jones only teaches to effect a prohibition on the printing of a coupon, at the time when it is sought to print the coupon out. Applicant submits that nothing has been found in *Jones* that would teach or suggest print information in the header of a print-prohibition part of the content, as recited in Claim 1. For this reason, as well, Applicant believes that Claim 1 is allowable over the art cited against it, even assuming for purposes of argument that the proposed combination of references would be a permissible one.

The other independent claims are each a method or a computer memory medium claim corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, or are directed to an apparatus having features substantially like those discussed above in connection with Claim 1, or to a system including such an apparatus. Accordingly, each of the independent claims is thought to be allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. All of the independent claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an

---

1/ It is of course to be understood that the claim scope is not limited by the details of this or any other particular embodiment that may be referred to.

additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1464237v1